

Silviu N. Bunta
Dayton, OH

**“YOUR OWN OF YOUR OWN”:
JEWISH ADAM SPECULATIONS
AND CHRISTIAN LITURGY
IN THE SLAVONIC AND ROMANIAN
LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE**

The title “Life of Adam and Eve” (henceforth *LAE*) is commonly used in reference to an entire corpus of literature¹ that contains the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses*,² the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*,³ the Armenian *Penitence of Adam*,⁴ the Slavonic *Book of Adam and Eve*,⁵ the Georgian

(1) For succinct introductions to this corpus, see particularly M. E. STONE, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) (SBLEJL, 3), and M. DE JONGE, J. TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

(2) This title is a misnomer based on an introduction prefaced to the text at a later time and uncritically appropriated by the earlier editions of the book (cf. M. DE JONGE, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as part of Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 201, n. 2). A synoptical presentation of the major text forms is available in John R. LEVISON, *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000) (SBLEJL, 16). Critical editions of the Greek text exist in A.-M. DENIS, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d’Ancien Testament* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, 1987); J. TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

(3) W. MEYER, *Vita Adae et Evae*, *Abhandlungen der königlichen Bayerischen Akademie des Wissenschaften, Philosoph.-philologische Klasse* 14 (1878) 185–250.

(4) M. E. STONE, *The Penitence of Adam* (Louvain: Peeters, 1981) (CSCO, 429–430); IDEM, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) (SBLEJL, 12) 70–81.

(5) Only the longer recension has received a critical edition to date: V. JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apocryphen, I: Die altkirchenslavischen Texte des Adambuches*, *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse* 42 (1893) 1–104. In 1925 Jordan Ivanov published another manuscript of the longer recension, MS 433 of the National Library in Sofia, which was apparently unknown to Jagić: I. IVANOV, *Bogomilski knigi i legendi* (Sofia, 1925). I consulted this work in its French translation, J. IVANOV,

Book of Adam,⁶ and the Romanian *Story of Adam and Eve* (*Povestea lui Adam și a Evei*).⁷ The Latin writing is the only one of these texts to actually carry the title used loosely in reference to the entire corpus. All text forms follow generally a similar story line. All texts narrate the expulsion of Adam and Eve from paradise, Abel's death at the hands of his brother Cain, a fatal illness of Adam, Adam's account of the fall, Eve's and Seth's quest for healing oil, Eve's account of the fall, Adam's death and assumption to paradise, Adam's burial, Abel's burial, and Eve's death and burial.

While the different versions of the story generally adhere to this structure, they diverge from each other significantly. One such disagreement occurs in the story of Adam's burial. Only the Slavonic and Romanian versions have God or, respectively, the earth pronouncing the phrase "your own of your own" (ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХ; *al tău dintr-ale tale*) during the entombment of Adam. While this phrase is immediately recognizable as one of the formulas of the Orthodox anaphora prayer and its presence in the Slavonic and Romanian *LAE* could be thus read simply as a very late liturgical insertion in an ancient text, the contention of this paper is that the odd Slavonic and Romanian texts are best read as witnesses to a much earlier conjunction between the Orthodox liturgical formula and ancient Jewish speculations about Adam appropriated by ancient Christianity.

Livres et légendes bogomiles: Aux sources du catharisme. Tr. M. RIBEYROL (Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 1976).

(6) French translation in J.-P. MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne de la Vita Adae*, in R. VAN DEN BROEK, M. J. VERMASEREN (eds.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 227–260.

(7) The only manuscript of the Romanian version published to date is MS 469: M. GASTER, *Texte române inedite din sec. XVII*, *Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie* 1 (1883) 78–80. Gaster reprinted the same text in his *Chrestomathie roumaine*, 2 vols. (Leipzig—Bucarest: Brockhaus-Socecu, 1891) Vol. 1, 63–65. Gaster also introduced the text in *Literatura populară română* (București: Ig. Haimann, 1883) 271–274. However, even this publication is incomplete. It only covers the final seven folios (400r–407r) of the text in its original Cyrillic characters. My forthcoming article, "The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*: The Oldest Manuscript of the Romanian Version" (*JSP*), is meant to fill in this gap. It provides the entire text of MS 469, with an English translation.

The Slavonic Recensions

The Texts

The Latin manuscripts of *LAE* do not contain an account of the burial of Adam similar to the other versions. Instead, it offers at this point in the narrative the *Legend of the Wood of the Cross*.⁸ The Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions of *LAE* contain similar versions of the beginning of Adam's burial service. The Greek text form I, represented by manuscripts D and S, reads:

And God called and said, "Adam, Adam." And the body answered from the earth and said, "Here I am, Lord." And God said to him, "I told you that earth you are and to earth shall you return (γῆ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσει). Again I promise to you the Resurrection; I will raise you up in the Resurrection with every man, who is your seed." After these words, God made a (three-fold)⁹ seal and sealed the tomb, that no one might do anything to him for six days till his rib should return to him.¹⁰

The other Greek text forms do not present any major differences.¹¹ The Armenian and Georgian versions do not differ from this text significantly.¹²

A significant departure from this story line occurs in the Slavonic texts. The Greek texts of *LAE* were translated into Slavonic sometime during the fourteenth century.¹³ The translation process produced two different recensions, one shorter than the other. Given the differences between these two Slavonic recensions, it is reasonable to assume that

(8) For a thorough analysis of the legend, see B. BAERT, *A Heritage of Holy Wood: The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 289–333.

(9) Τρίγγωνον/τρίγωνον only appears in text forms II and III. See the Greek texts in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109.

(10) The English translation is the one published in G. A. ANDERSON, M. E. STONE, *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2nd 1999) 89–90E. I used the Greek text in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(11) The main Greek text-forms are presented in LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(12) For the Armenian and Georgian versions, see MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne...*; STONE, *The Penitence of Adam...*; IDEM, *Texts and Concordances of the Armenian Adam Literature...*

(13) É. TURDEANU, *Apocryphes Slaves et Roumains de l'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 90–93, 99–100.

they were most probably produced independently of each other, from two distinct Greek versions, even though there is no extant Greek text to resemble the shorter Slavonic recension.¹⁴

The longer recension, published in the 1893 critical edition of Vatroslav Jagić,¹⁵ generally agrees with the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian witnesses to the above story. Like in all of these, in the longer Slavonic text God calls Adam, Adam's body answers, and God reminds the protoplast of his destiny to return to the earth from which he was made. In further agreement with the other texts, the longer Slavonic recension contains the promise of a future resurrection of Adam and of all humankind. However, in contrast to the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian witnesses, the longer Slavonic recension describes God as making the sign of the cross over Adam's tomb and pronouncing what sounds like a votive formula, "what is yours, taken from you":

And the Lord called Adam to himself and said, "Adam, Adam, where are you?" And his body answered, "I am here, Lord." The Lord said [to Adam], "So I told you, 'You are earth and to the same earth you will return again.' And at the resurrection, you will rise with all mankind." And the Lord made on four sides the sign of the cross over his grave, and one laid him in the grave, and he anointed it and said, "What is yours, taken from you (ꙗꙗꙗꙗ ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ), is again returned to you." (Slavonic LAE 47)¹⁶

One is left to assume that the final divine utterance is addressed to the earth, particularly since God has just reminded Adam that he is to return to the earth from which he was taken. In the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions the same idea surfaces earlier in the narrative. In all these versions, a voice from the earth (Greek) or from heaven (Armenian and Georgian) stops the burial of Abel from taking place before Adam's, by saying that what has first been taken from the earth must be first returned to the earth.¹⁷

(14) I have argued this in my forthcoming article, "The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*."

(15) JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 1–104.

(16) The English translation is the one published in ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 90E. The Slavonic text is the one published in JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 98.

(17) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

In contrast to the longer recension, in the shorter Slavonic version God speaks as a “voice from heaven” (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ)¹⁸ and addresses the phrase ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХ explicitly to the earth. Manuscripts *pp*, arguably the best witness to the shorter Slavonic recension,¹⁹ and *tr* read И ЗЕМЛИ РЕЧЕ ТВОА ѿ ТВОИХЪ, “and to the earth he [God] said, ‘Your own from your own’.”²⁰

Orthodox Liturgy

The phrase “your own of your own” is part of the anaphora prayer in the Byzantine liturgies of St. John Chrysostom²¹ and St. Basil,²² and in the Alexandrian liturgies of St. Basil²³ and St. Mark.²⁴ It has been previously noted²⁵ that most probably the earliest witness to the incorporation of this formula into Christian liturgy could very well occur in Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5:

Inasmuch, then, as the Church offers with single-mindedness, her gift is justly reckoned a pure sacrifice with God. As Paul also says to the Philippians, “I am full, having received from Epaphroditus the things that were sent from you, the odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, pleasing to God” (Phil 4:18). For it behoves us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Maker, in a pure mind, and in faith without hypocrisy, in well-grounded hope, in fervent love, offering the first-fruits of His own created things. And the Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, *offering to Him, with giving of thanks, from His creation...*

(18) I have consulted manuscripts *pp* and *tr* in Н. С. ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники отреченной русской литературы, 2 т. (Санкт-Петербург—Москва, 1863) Т. 1, 298–304, here p. 303, and respectively 1:1–6, here p. 5, and manuscript *pp*¹ in А. Н. ПЫПИН, Памятники старинной русской литературы, 3 т. (Санкт-Петербург, 1860–1862) Т. 3, 4–7.

(19) See Turdeanu’s argument in *Apocryphes*, 100.

(20) This is my own translation of *pp* from ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 303. Manuscript *tr* (ТИХОПРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 5–6) contains the same text.

(21) R. F. ТАФТ, St. John Chrysostom and the Byzantine Anaphora that Bears His Name, in: P. F. БРАДШАУ (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1997) 195–226, here pp. 220–221.

(22) А. НÄNGGI, I. РАHL (eds.), *Præx eucharistica. Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti* (Fribourg: Editions universitaires, 1968) 236.

(23) *Ibid.*, 352.

(24) *Ibid.*, 114.

(25) E.g., ТАФТ, St. John Chrysostom..., 220, n. 56.

We offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and Spirit. For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity.²⁶

The phrase is clearly attested as part of the Liturgy of St. John in the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John*.²⁷ The writing contains Jesus' answers to a long series of questions by John of Patmos relating to fasting, monastic behavior, communion, and the liturgy. The original publisher of the text, F. Nau, dates the text to between the fifth and eighth centuries and prefers a date closer to the fifth century.²⁸ J. K. Elliot proposes a possible range of dating between the sixth and eighth centuries.²⁹ In the second edition of the text, John M. Court supports a date between the fifth and eighth centuries.³⁰ More recently, Alice Whealey suggests that verse 13 contains a reference to iconoclasm and that other passages reflect the threat of Muslim conquest. Therefore, she argues, the text should be dated to the early Islamic period, specifically between the 720's and 843.³¹

In its short explanation of the liturgy, the text relates the phrase τὰ σα̅ ἐκ τῶν σα̅ων with the tradition about Jesus' descent into Hades:

"We offer to you what is yours from your own" (τὰ σα̅ ἐκ τῶν σα̅ων) means that the Lord went into Hell and destroyed the spirits of wickedness and the gates of Hell, and resurrected the first-created man, Adam (συνύγρηεν τὸν προτόπλαστον Ἀδᾶμ). Then he said to the spirits, "We offer you what is yours from your own, in all and through all

(26) Translation from ANF.

(27) F. NAU, the discoverer of the manuscript, provided the first publication of the text, with a French translation, in: Une deuxième apocalypse apocryphe grecque de Saint Jean, *Revue Biblique* 11 (1914) 209–221. The Greek text has been republished with an English translation in J. M. COURT, *The Book of Revelation and the Johannine Apocalyptic Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

(28) NAU, *Une deuxième apocalypse...*, 213.

(29) J. K. ELLIOT, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 684.

(30) COURT, *The Book of Revelation...*, 72.

(31) A. WHEALEY, *The Apocryphal Apocalypse of John: A Byzantine Apocalypse from the Early Islamic Period*, *JTS* 53 (2002) 533–540.

(Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρονταις, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα).
The angels answered with the praise “We praise you.”³²

The phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν was evidently part of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom by the eighth century.

There is also extensive evidence that the phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν was used as a common votive formula as early as the sixth century. With no explicit connection to the anaphora (although probably alluding to it), the formula appears on a sixth-century cross at Sinai, on a sixth-century chalice, on a baptismal font from shortly before 597, on an inscription mounted by Justinian somewhere in an Ephesus church, and under a window in a sixth-century church at Iznik.³³ Its inscription on the altar of St. Sophia, ordered according to Georgios Kedrenos by Justinian and Theodora,³⁴ is more explicitly a reference to the anaphora prayer.³⁵ This cumulative evidence supports Robert F. Taft’s conclusion that the phrase “was liturgical Formelgut already by the sixth century and probably entered the liturgy even earlier.”³⁶ Moreover, it also seems that the phrase circulated quite widely as a common votive formula during the sixth century.

This history of the phrase in the liturgical traditions of eastern Christianity could explain its occurrence in the Slavonic (and Romanian) versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. As seen above, already in between the fifth and eighth centuries the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John* associates the phrase with Adam. Specifically, this is the phrase that Jesus says to the angels when he raises the protoplast from hell. The scene obviously implies that Adam’s original and proper place was with the angels. Despite the fact that the association of Adam with angels is a traditional motif in both ancient Judaism and Christianity,³⁷ the scene is not unproblematic. First, it implies that Christ brings

(32) Text and translation from COURT, *The Book of Revelation...*, 80–81.

(33) This evidence is reviewed in K. WEITZMANN, I. ŠEVČENKO, The Moses Cross at Sinai, *DOP* 17 (1963) 385–398, here pp. 392–394.

(34) *Historiarum compendium* in I. BEKKER (ed.), *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae I* (Bonn: Weber, 1838), 677 (= PG 121, 737).

(35) WEITZMANN, ŠEVČENKO, The Moses Cross..., 394; G. DOWNEY, The Inscription on a Silver Chalice from Syria in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, *American Journal of Archaeology* 55 (1951) 349–353, here p. 351.

(36) TAFT, *St. John Chrysostom...*, 220–221.

(37) To cite only a few studies: Ch. GIESCHEN, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 153–155; C. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)

an offering to angels, who are his inferiors in the *Apocalypse*. Second, Adam's return to heaven cannot commonly be an offering "in all and through all."

However, the scene, even in its difficult elements, parallels strongly the Slavonic version of *LAE*. First, just as in the *Apocalypse*, in both recensions of the Slavonic *LAE* the offering is Adam. Second, in both texts the one to make the offering is Christ. Unlike the Greek recensions, which simply name the central character of the burial ceremony as θεός,³⁸ the Slavonic longer recension identifies him specifically as Christ (χc: section 46).³⁹ Third, in both texts Christ makes the offering by pronouncing the same offering phrase, "your own of your own." Fourth, there is an obvious parallelism between Adam's death and his resurrection or salvation from hell. The commitment of Adam's body to the earth mirrors the commitment of his body to heaven. The latter solves the former. Moreover, the Slavonic *LAE* specifically introduces Adam's entombment with a reference to the protoplast's future resurrection.

This complex parallelism between the Slavonic version of *LAE* and the *Apocalypse of St. John Chrysostom* suggests that the votive formula **Ѡ БОА Ѡ Ѡ БОИХЪ** has already been associated with Adam by the eighth century and that the Slavonic version of Adam's burial is not a fourteenth century innovation inserted arbitrarily into the narrative of *LAE*, but it is rather the development of an ancient Adam speculation.

140–145; IDEM, *All the Glory of Adam* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 88–135; J. FOSSUM, The Adorable Adam of the Mystics and the Rebuttals of the Rabbis, in: *Geschichte, Tradition, Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) Vol. 1, 529–539; S. NIDITCH, The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34 (1983) 137–146; A. SEGAL, *Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 108–115; P. SCHÄFER, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1975); B. BARC, La taille cosmique d'Adam dans la littérature juive rabbinique des trois premiers siècles après J.-C., *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 49 (1975) 173–185; J. JERVELL, *Imago Dei: Gen 1:26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulischen Briefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 99–100, 105–107; W. D. DAVIES, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London: SPCK, 1948) 45–46; A. ALTMANN, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 35 (1945) 371–391.

(38) LEVISON, *Texts in Transition...*, 109–110.

(39) JAGIĆ, *Slavische Beiträge...*, 98.

Furthermore, there is a subtle parallelism between the Slavonic text, on the one hand, and the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian narrative in which an intervening voice stops the burial of Abel from taking place before Adam's.⁴⁰ First, in the Armenian and Georgian narratives the divine presence speaks as a voice from heaven⁴¹ as it does in the shorter Slavonic recension (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ).⁴² Second and more significantly, the subject of all these versions is the return of Adam to the earth from which he was taken.

The Romanian Version

The Romanian version of Adam's burial points to another connection of *LAE* to ancient Adam speculations, that are attested both within Christian and Jewish sources.

The Texts

The Romanian version of *LAE* contains only the shorter recension and is undoubtedly translated from Slavonic.⁴³ It survives in eight manuscripts, namely 469 (384r–407r), 1255 (18r–18v), 2158 (9r–12r), 3813 (91r–101v), 5299 (1r–6r), all known to and introduced by Émile Turdeanu,⁴⁴ and 3275 (1r–5v), 5022 (208r–212v), and respectively 5916 (14v–23v), all from Biblioteca Academiei Române, that is, the Library of the Romanian Academy (henceforth BAR). Differences between the Romanian shorter recension and the extant manuscripts of the shorter Slavonic recension suggest that the Romanian text attests to a manuscript tradition that is no longer extant in Slavonic.⁴⁵

The Romanian version is the only extant text form of the entire *LAE* corpus in which the *earth* addresses the offering formula “your own of your own” to *God*. The oldest known manuscript of the Romanian recension, MS 469, reads:

Și fu glas din ceri de grăi: “Adame, Adame!” El zise: “Ce iaste, Doamne?” Dumnezeu zise: “Crez spusu-[ț]-am ție, că din pământ ești și iară în pământ veri merge.” Iară pământul zise: “Al tău dintr-

(40) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

(41) *Ibid.*

(42) ТИХОНРАВОВ, ПАМЯТНИКИ..., т. 1, 303; ПЫПИН, ПАМЯТНИКИ..., т. 3, 5.

(43) See the introduction in TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 104–110.

(44) TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 104–110.

(45) I have made this argument in my article “The Shorter Recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*”.

ale tale, ție aduce de toate.” Așa îngropară pre Adam cu cununa ce era în capul lui.⁴⁶

And a voice came from heaven and said: “Adam, Adam!” He said: “Yes, Lord?” God said: “Believe now what I told you, that you are earth and to earth you will go.” And the earth said: “Your own from your own, to you we bring all.” Thus they buried Adam with the wreath that was on his head.⁴⁷

Turdeanu, Moses Gaster, and Nicolae Cartoian, all agree that MS 469 dates from the first quarter of the seventeenth century.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Cartoian notes that most probably the text is not an autograph, but only a copy of a translation from Slavonic made in the sixteenth century, if not earlier.⁴⁹ The fact that the text was produced by two different hands, as I have noticed in my own study of the manuscript, supports Cartoian’s statement. The first copyist produced folios 384r to 393r. The handwriting is askew and untidy. The second hand produced the second half of the text, in a neat penmanship. It is highly unlikely that this variation would occur in the original translation. Therefore, it does seem that the origins of the text of MS 469 should be sought in the sixteenth century, if not even earlier.

Another valuable manuscript of the Romanian version, namely BAR 3813, does not present major differences from MS 469:

Și s-au făcut glas din ceri grăind: “Adame, Adame!” Și el au zis: “Doamne?” Domnul au zis: “Ți-am spus ție, că din pământ ești și iar în pământ te vei intoarce.” Iar pământul au zis: “Al tău dintru ale tale, ție aducem de toate.” Așa au îngropat pe Adam cu cununa ce era în capul lui.⁵⁰

And a voice came from heaven saying: “Adam, Adam!” And he said: “Lord?” The Lord said: “I told you, that you are earth and to earth you will return.” And the earth said: “Your own from your own, to you we bring all.” Thus they buried Adam with the wreath that was on his head.⁵¹

(46) BAR MS 469, f. 406r–406v.

(47) This is my own translation.

(48) TURDEANU, *Apocryphes...*, 106; GASTER, *Chrestomathie roumaine...*, vol. 1, 63; IDEM, *Texte române inedite din sec. XVII...*, 74; N. CARTOIAN, *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, 2 vols. (București: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1929, 1938) Vol. 1, 49, 57.

(49) CARTOIAN, *Cărțile populare...*, vol. 1, 57.

(50) BAR MS 3813, f. 101r.

(51) This is my own translation.

The mention of “a voice from heaven” parallels the same story in the shorter Slavonic recension (ГЛАСЪ СО/СЪ НЕБЕСИ)⁵² and the Armenian and Georgian stories of the interruption of Abel’s entombment.⁵³ In the Greek versions of the latter story, it is the earth that speaks out against Abel’s burial. The Romanian version of Adam’s burial is the only one in which the earth speaks. Adam remains the object of the votive formula “your own of your own,” but in the unique case of the Romanian version the formula is addressed to God. This use of the phrase “your own of your own” presents Adam as standing in a special relationship to God. This idea reflects the early liturgical and votive use of the phrase, in which, as noted above, the formula is always addressed to God, with the sole extraordinary exception of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of St. John*. Moreover, the offering of Adam’s body to God rather than to the earth, as “your own of your own,” echoes, I would contend, ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about Adam.

*The Return of Adam to God
in Jewish and Christian Speculations
about Adam*

Several studies have noted that the phrase of the eastern liturgies, “your own of your own,” is most probably based on the Septuagint rendering of 1 Chron 29:14: σὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δεδώκαμέν σοι.⁵⁴ However, Enrico Mazza astutely remarks that early Christian sources do not seem to use 1 Chron 29:14.⁵⁵ It is possible that Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5 alludes to it, but the connection is not absolutely certain.

In contrast to the silence of ancient Christian sources, the passage is commented upon in early rabbinic texts.⁵⁶ In a particular case the phrase is used to construct an anthropological concept. *Mishnah Avot/ Pirqe Avot* 3, a text slightly later than Irenaeus’ *Adv. haereses* 4.18.4–5, attests to a Jewish tradition circulating already in the third century

(52) ТИХОНРАВОВ, Памятники..., т. 1, 303; ПЫПИЦ, Памятники..., т. 3, 5.

(53) ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 88–88E.

(54) TAFT, *St. John Chrysostom...*, 220; E. MAZZA, *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rites* (New York: Pueblo, 1986) 77, 304; R. J. LEDOGAR, *The Eucharistic Prayer and the Gifts over Which It Is Spoken*, in: R. KEVIN SEASOLTZ (ed.), *Living Bread, Saving Cup* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1987) 60–79, here p. 73.

(55) Cf. MAZZA, *Eucharistic Prayers...*, 304, n. 114.

(56) See also *Exod. Rab.* 31:9.

that interprets 1 Chron 29:14 as a statement on the iconic nature of humanity:

R. Eleazar of Bartotha said: Give him what is his, for you and yours are his (תן לו משלו שאתה ושלך שלו). For so does it say about David, 'For all things come of you, and of your own have we given you' (1 Chron 29:14). (*Mishnah Avot/Pirqa Avot 3*)⁵⁷

According to this text, 1 Chron 29:14 is about the giving of the human person to God. The two stand in an iconic relation. Moreover, 1 Chron 29:14, according to R. Eleazar of Bartotha,⁵⁸ presents an ethical imperative to dedicate the icon, the human person, to its paradigm, God.

The same anthropological statement, accompanied by the same ethical imperative, resurfaces in *Lev. Rab.* 34:3:

Hillel the Elder once, when he concluded his studies with his disciples, walked along with them. His disciples asked him: Master, whither are you bound? He answered them: To perform a religious duty. What, they asked, is this religious duty? He said to them: To wash in the bath-house. Said they: Is this a religious duty? Yes, he replied; if the statues (אִיקוֹנוֹתַיִם) of kings, which are erected in theatres and circuses, are scoured and washed by the man who is appointed to look after them, and who thereby obtains his maintenance through them—nay more, he is exalted in the company of the great of the kingdom — how much more I, who have been created in the image and likeness; as it is written, For in the image of God made He man (Gen 9:6). (*Lev. Rab.* 34:3)⁵⁹

I have shown elsewhere how the rabbinic speculation about the iconic value of humanity is often illustrated with parables about the

(57) Translation from J. NEUSNER, *Judaism and Story: The Evidence of the Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) 161–172, here p. 165; see also IDEM, *The Mishnah. A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991) 679. For the poetry of this *Pirqa Aboth* passage, see A. D. TROPPEL, *Wisdom, Politics, and Historiography. Tractate Avot in the Context of the Graeco-Roman Near East* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 84.

(58) I do not take the attributions of early rabbinic traditions to be historical.

(59) H. FREEDMAN, N. SIMON (eds.), *Midrash Rabbah*, 10 vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1961) Vol. *Leviticus*, 428. The story is retold slightly different in *Abot R. Nat.* B 30.

Roman emperor and his cultic statues.⁶⁰ The same iconic association between humanity and the divine, extended in the same way into a similar ethical imperative, and illustrated through a parallelism with images of the Roman emperor, transpires in the story of Mt 22:15–21 (and parallels: Mark 12:14–17, Luke 20:22–25):

Then the Pharisees went and plotted to entrap him in what he said. So they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are sincere, and teach the way of God in accordance with truth, and show deference to no one; for you do not regard people with partiality. Tell us, then, what you think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?" But Jesus, aware of their malice, said, "Why are you putting me to the test, you hypocrites? Show me the coin used for the tax." And they brought him a denarius. Then he said to them, "Whose head is this, and whose title?" They answered, "The emperor's." Then he said to them, "Give therefore to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's." (Mt 22:15–21, NRSV)

Jesus' imperative at the end of this story closely echoes the interpretation of 1 Chron 29:14 in *Mishnah Avot/Pirqe Avot* 3: "Give him [that is, God] what is his, for you and yours are his." Tertullian perceptively notes the more or less subtle anthropological meaning of Jesus' saying. For the North African writer, the story is about the iconic nature of humanity.⁶¹ What people are to give to God are their own beings, because they belong to God in the first place:

What things, then, are Caesar's? Those, to wit, about which the consultation was then held, whether the poll-tax should be furnished to Caesar or no. Therefore, too, the Lord demanded that the money should be shown Him, and inquired about the image, whose it was; and when He had heard it was Caesar's, said, "Render to Caesar

(60) S. BUNTA, The Likeness of the Image: Adamic Motifs and **צלם** Anthropology in Rabbinic Traditions about Jacob's Image Enthroned in Heaven, *JSJ* 37 (2006) 55–84, particularly pp. 76–82.

(61) Several scholars have also made the argument that the gospel text is best understood as a statement about the iconic value of humanity. See M. RIST, Caesar or God (Mark 12:13–17)? A Study in "Formgeschichte", *Journal for the Study of Religion* 16 (1936) 317–331, particularly p. 328; Ch. H. GIBLIN, The 'Things of God' in the Question Concerning Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20:25; Mk 12:17; Mt 20:21), *CBQ* 33 (1971) 510–527; D. T. OWEN-BALL, Rabbinic Rhetoric and the Tribute Passage (Mt. 22:15–22; Mk. 12:13–17; Lk. 20:20–26), *NT* 35 (1993) 1–14.

what are Caesar's, and what are God's to God"; that is, the image of Caesar, which is on the coin, to Caesar, and the image of God, which is on man, to God (*et imaginem Dei Deo, quae in homine est*); so as to render to Caesar indeed money, to God yourself (*Deo temetipsum*). (*On Idolatry* 15)⁶²

The use of the phrase "your own of your own" for the relation between God and Adam in the Romanian recension of *LAE* reflects a similar iconic anthropology and closely echoes these ancient Jewish and Christian speculations. Like in *Mishnah Avot/Pirque Avot* 3 and Mt 22: 15–21, in the Romanian version of the pseudepigraphon the referents of the votive phrase are God and humanity. While in all other versions the phrase is about humanity and the earth, in the Romanian recension the earth says the votive formula to God over Adam's inanimate body. The emphasis on Adam's physical resemblance to God is implicit.

This proposed reading of the Romanian text coincides with the strong emphasis throughout the *LAE* corpus on Adam's iconic status. Thus, the Latin, Armenian, and Georgian versions contain the story of the fall of Satan. Michael Stone has convincingly argued that, even if the Greek version lacks this passage, it implicitly assumes the tradition in the development of its narrative,⁶³ as do, one may add, the Romanian and Slavonic versions. The Georgian version of the story reads:

¹³ Le diable lui (i.e. to Adam) répondit et lui dit: "[Tu ne m'as (rien) fait,]⁶⁴ mais c'est à cause de toi que je suis tombé sur la terre. Le jour même où tu fus créé, ce jour là, je tombai de la face de Dieu parce que, comme Dieu t'avait soufflé l'Esprit sur ton visage, tu avais l'image et la ressemblance de la divinité. Puis Michel arriva; [il te présenta et te fait prosterner devant Dieu].⁶⁵ Et Dieu dit à Michel: 'J'ai créé Adam selon (mon) image et ma divinité.' ¹⁴ Alors Michel vint; il convoqua toutes les troupes des anges et il leur dit: 'Prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité.' Or, quand Michel les convoqua et que tous se prosternèrent devant toi, il me convoqua moi aussi et je lui dis: 'Éloigne toi de moi, car je ne saurais me prosterner de-

(62) Translation from ANF. I have consulted the Latin text in PL 1:683.

(63) M. STONE, *The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on The Books of Adam and Eve*, *JTS* 44 (1993) 153–156.

(64) I provided between brackets the correction that J.-P. Mahé subsequently made to his original translation (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, vii).

(65) The words between brackets contain the correction that Mahé subsequently made to his original translation "il (ordonna) qu'on se prosternât devant toi en présence de Dieu" (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 16E).

vant celui qui est plus jeune que moi; en effet, avant celui-ci, je suis seigneur, et c'est à lui qu'il convient de se prosterner devant moi.'¹⁵ Cela, d'autres anges des six classes l'entendirent et ma parole leur plut et ils ne se prosternèrent pas devant toi.¹⁶ Alors Dieu s'irrita contre nous et il nous ordonna, à eux et à moi, de descendre de nos demeures vers la terre." (Georgian *LAE* 13:1–16:1)⁶⁶

The tradition associates the angelic worship of Adam with the protoplast's identity as the image of God. As John R. Levison emphasizes, "the image consists of physical similarity to God."⁶⁷ This physical resemblance enables Adam to function as a cultic statue of God. The connection between Adam's physical resemblance to God and the angelic worship of Adam is evident in Michael's command to Satan: *adorate imaginem domini dei* in Latin, and "prosternez vous devant le semblable et l'image de la divinité" in Georgian. *Astowac*,⁶⁸ which the Armenian version uses for Adam's iconic function,⁶⁹ means both 'god' and 'idol.'⁷⁰ Given the latter connotation, the Armenian version better reflects the early Second Temple conception of Adam as the equivalent of a pagan cult statue or idol.⁷¹

(66) Translation from MAHÉ, *Le Livre d'Adam géorgienne de la Vita Adae...*, 234–235. The tradition is also preserved in *Apoc. Sedr.* 5:1–2. The opposition of the fallen angels to the worship of the iconic Adam is also recorded in several Jewish-Christian and Christian sources, such as *Gospel of Bartholomew* 4:52–56, a Coptic text attributed to Peter of Alexandria, a Coptic *Encomium on Michael*, a Coptic *Enthronement of Michael*, the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, Origen's *De Principiis* I.V.4–5, and Tertullian's *On Patience* 5. The extensive presence of the tradition in third century Christian sources indicates that it had a widespread circulation in second century Jewish circles.

(67) J. R. LEVISON, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988) (JSPSS, 1) 178.

(68) I follow here the transliteration of classical Armenian proposed by R. W. THOMPSON, *An Introduction to Classical Armenian* (Delmar, NY: Caravan Books, 1989) 11–12.

(69) "Bow down to god (*Astowac*) whom I have made" (ANDERSON, STONE, *A Synopsis...*, 16E). Stone notes that manuscript no. 3461 from Erevan, Matenadaran, replaces *astowac* with Adam (*The Penitence of Adam*, 2:4, n. 1 on ch. 14).

(70) B. A. OLSEN, *The Noun in Biblical Armenian* (Berlin—New York: M. de Gruyter, 1999) 545–546. *Astowac* translates the Hebrew Bible use of ʾēlōhîm for idols: Exod 20:23; 34:15–17; Num 25:2; Deut 4:28; Josh 24:14.

(71) Adam's resemblance to God is offered as justification for worship in *Gospel of Bartholomew* and *Encomium on Michael*. The reading of the latter

General Conclusions

The evidence presented in this article leads to the following tentative conclusions:

1. The Romanian version of the *Life of Adam and Eve* preserves the only text form in which, during the burial of Adam's body, the phrase "your own of your own" is addressed by the earth to God. All other extant versions have God utter the phrase to the earth. Thus these versions understand Adam's body to be a possession of the earth, while the Romanian recension associates the body of the protoplast with God.

2. The phrase is identical to the votive formula that has been part of the anaphora prayer in the Byzantine liturgies from as early as the fifth century.

3. The Romanian use of the formula in reference to God echoes better the early liturgical and votive history of the phrase (in which it is almost always addressed to God) and fits best within the context of the ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of humanity and, implicitly and particularly, of the protoplast. Two of these texts, *Mishnah Avot/Pirqe Avot* 3 and Mt 22:15–21, contain very similar votive phrases and in both cases, just like in the Romanian text, the one to whom the offering should be made is God and the offering is the human person.

4. Slightly more than a decade ago, Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp astutely noted that in recent scholarship

it has rightly become less natural to assume that an old, more primitive stage in a writing's development is intrinsically more important than later stages, especially if one acknowledges (as the present authors do) that later stages of the writing may contain traditions that are older than the earlier stages of the writing which do not contain those traditions.⁷²

The cumulative evidence analyzed in this article presents an illustrative case. The idiosyncratic presence in the Slavonic and Romanian versions of *LAE* of the liturgical/votive phrase "your own of your own" (ГБОЛ ѿ ГБОНХ; *al tău dintr-ale tale*) reflects, despite the lateness of the manuscripts, ancient developments in the Christian liturgy. Fur-

is worth mentioning: "The angels beheld the likeness and image of God in Adam and they fell down and worshipped him and gave him glory *as the likeness of God* [my emphasis]" (CRUM, *Texts Attributed...*, 396–397, n. 3).

(72) DE JONGE, TROMP, *The Life of Adam and Eve...*, 65.

thermore, the Romanian use of the formula in reference to God echoes ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of humanity and, implicitly and particularly, of the protoplast.

5. It is probable that the Romanian version owes this idiosyncratic element to an early text form that is no longer extant in Greek or Slavonic. The addressing of the votive formula to God may have collapsed, at later states of transmission, into another element of the larger narrative, namely, the proper return of Adam's body to the earth from which it was taken.

This speaks for the ongoing fluidity of the Adamic corpus throughout late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

SUMMARY

The Romanian version of the *Life of Adam and Eve* preserves the only text form in which, during the burial of Adam's body, the offering formula "your own of your own," which has been used in eastern liturgies from as early as the sixth century, is addressed by the earth to God. All other extant versions have God utter the phrase to the earth. Thus these versions understand Adam's body to be a possession of the earth, while the Romanian recension associates the body of the protoplast with God. Similar votive phrases, based primarily on 1 Chron 29:14, are used in ancient Jewish and Christian speculations to describe the iconic relation between humanity, particularly the human body, and God. This paper argues that, in its idiosyncratic reading, the Romanian recension of the *Life of Adam and Eve*, although preserved in late medieval manuscripts, seems to reflect the merger of the eastern liturgical formula with these ancient Jewish and Christian speculations about the iconic nature of Adam.